

### REMARKS

A total of 34 claims remain in the present application. The foregoing amendments are presented in response to the Office Action mailed December 13, 2007, wherefore reconsideration of this application is requested.

By way of the above-noted amendments, claim 35 has been amended to more particularly define features of the present invention. More specifically, claim 35 has been amended to define that each member profile contains “respective communications information identifying types of communication in which the team member prefers to participate, and, for each identified type of communication, a respective communication device that the team member prefers to use to participate in that type of communication”.

In preparing the above-noted amendments, careful attention was paid to ensure that no new subject matter has been introduced. Furthermore, it is believed that the foregoing amendments do not give rise to any new issues requiring further search or examination. Accordingly, entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments are believed to be proper, and such action is courteously solicited.

Referring now to the text of the Office Action:

- claims 2-8, 10-15, 19-21 and 23-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being unpatentable over the teaching of United States Patent No. 6,697,840 (Godefroid).

The Examiners claim rejections are believed to be traversed by the above-noted claim amendments, and further in view of the following discussion.

As discussed in applicant's response filed September 24, 2007, , Godefroid teaches (at column 8 lines 40-43) that a user's “presence information “may include their door status, availability information, location, calendar information, phone number, email address, or the like.” However, apart from a broad statement that the user's awareness preference information may indicate the “user's willingness to engage in interactions (door status)”, Godefroid is

completely silent about the use of profiles to indicate a user's "respective set of preferences ... for participating in each one of a plurality of different types of communications" as required by previous claim 35. More particularly, providing a user's e-mail address and phone number(s) in their profile may indicate the user's *ability* to engage in various types of communication, but says nothing about their *willingness* or *desire* to do so. For example, a user may be willing to receive e-mails, but unwilling to engage in text messaging sessions. Godefroind provides no mechanism by which this type of control over communications can be implemented by the user.

Similarly, a user may be willing to receive e-mails, but not instant messaging; or the user may prefer to receive e-mails at one device (e.g. a hand-held PDA), and instant messages at a different device (e.g. a cellular hand-set.). Again, Godefroind provides no mechanism by which this level of control over communications can be implemented by the user. Thus, Applicant is of the view that Godefroind fails to teach or fairly suggest the features of the invention as defined in previous claim 35, when interpreted fairly in light of the specification.

However, and notwithstanding the foregoing, Applicant has further amended claim 35 so as to even more clearly define the features of the present invention. Thus, claim 35 has been amended to define that each member profile contains "respective communications information identifying types of communication in which the team member prefers to participate, and, for each identified type of communication, a respective communication device that the team member prefers to use to participate in that type of communication". None of the known prior art teaches or fairly suggests this feature.

Godefroind merely teaches that a user may provide a "phone number, email address, or the like". This information nominally identifies a communications device (insofar as a phone number identifies a cellular telephone handset, for example) but it provides no indication of what type(s) of communication the user prefers to participate in using those devices.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the presently claimed invention is clearly distinguishable over the teaching of the cited references, taken alone or in any combination. Thus it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and early action in that respect is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
THOMPSON, et al.

By:

/Kent Daniels/

Kent Daniels, P.Eng.  
Registration No. 44,206  
Customer No. 020988